



DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY

P. O. BOX 4502
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22204-4502

IN REPLY
REFER TO: PL62

6 April 2009

Amendment B – Issued to answer additional contractor questions.

SUBJECT: Request for Proposal (RFP) for Tracking Number DTOMC95023 (Repost)
Web Services Notification Support

Dear Program Manager:

1. The Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) issued a Request for Proposal on 4 March 2009 for the Statement of Work (SOW) entitled, “Web Services Notification.” The period of performance is for one year with two option years. For details of the requirement and evaluation criteria, please see Attachment #1, Statement of Work; Attachment #2, Evaluation Criteria; Attachment #3, DD254 Contract Security Classification Specification; and Attachment #4, Organizational Conflict of Interest of the 4 March 2009 RFP. Amendment A was posted on 27 March 2009 to answer contractor questions.
2. The following contains additional contractor questions and government answers.

Question 1: SOW Section 6.2 – Implementation and Integration Support

The requirements of sections 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 do not provide sufficient detail to accurately determine the level of effort required to complete this task. Please provide detail on the estimated FTE count and specific detail on the scope of this section.

Answer: A question of this nature was previously asked and answered. Please see the response to Question 5 of Amendment A.

Question 2: SOW Section 6.2.1 – JCTD-NCES Integration Support

Please provide clarification on expectations concerning vulnerability testing. What are the specifics concerning both the frequency of the testing and what hardware/software components will be tested? What, if any, are the specific vulnerability testing tools that the Government prefers? Will the contractor be responsible for providing the testing tools?

Answer: The contractor is required to support testing as described in Section 6.2.1 of the SOW.

Question 3: SOW Section 6.2.1 – JCTD-NCES Integration Support

Please provide clarification on what COTS software for the JUM is being referenced in the statement: “The contractor shall implement Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) 140-2 compliant Commercial Off-the Shelf (COTS) software for the JUM.” Will the contractor be responsible for purchasing this referenced software and required licenses? Will the contractor be responsible for ensuring that the software is FIPS 140-2 compliant?

Answer: The COTS software referred to is Seros, which is FIPS 140-2 compliant.

Question 4: SOW Section 6.2.4.1 – Training (REQUIRED)

Please provide clarification of the Government’s expectation for the required training. The RFP states that web-based training is required, however further details in section 6.2.4.1 indicate that this would be a live training requirement. If live training is required, what is the estimated total number of users to be trained over the contract term? If required, will live training occur on Government premises?

Answer: It is web-based training; however, if onsite training is required outside of the National Capital Region, those training requirements will be included in a future contract modification.

Question 5: SOW Section 6.2.4.1 – Training (REQUIRED)

If the training is completely web-based, will the contractor be responsible for hosting the web-based training materials or will these materials be hosted on DISA Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) servers?

Answer: The contractor and the government will provide hosting for the training materials.

Question 6: SOW Section 6.2.4.1 – Training (REQUIRED)

The section states: “The contractor will provide web-based training...during the base year of the task order...” Will the Government require training in the contract option years if they are exercised?

Answer: If needed in the option period, training requirements will be identified at that time

Question 7: SOW Section 6.2.4.2 – Training (OPTIONAL)

Section references 6.2.3.1 to describe additional classes, however that section does not exist in the SOW. Are these classes the same as referenced in 6.2.4.1? Please provide descriptions of the additional classes referenced.

Answer: That is a typographical error. Reference should read 6.2.4.1.

Question 8: SOW Section 6.2.5 – Seros© Licensing

As the RFP is requesting renewal for Seros© IDS maintenance and not the initial product, would the Government please identify the incumbent contractor that provided the initial development and implementation for this project?

Answer: A question of this nature was previously asked and answered. Please see the response to Question 1 of Amendment A.

Question 9: SOW Section 6.2.5 – Seros© Licensing

Seros© is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Solers Inc., a contractor currently working in DISA. Since it is the Government’s intention to conduct a best value award, would this relationship prevent Solers from participating in this effort since they will be able to exert unique influence on the pricing they receive for Seros licensing as well as the pricing offered to other interested vendors? If Solers is allowed to participate, how does the Government intend to conduct a fair competition when the license renewal and optional appliance hardware pricing are an evaluation factor?

Answer: A question of this nature was previously asked and answered. Please see the response to Question 8 of Amendment A.

Question 10: SOW Section 6.2.5 – Seros© Licensing

Do the Seros products being requested in 6.2.5 meet the COTS commerciality definition as described in FAR Subpart 2.101 or is the software considered a customized product solution?

Answer: Seros products are commercial items.

Question 11: SOW Section 6.2.5 – Seros© Licensing

FAR Subpart 9.505-1 raises the concern that any contractor providing systems engineering and technical direction should not be in a position to make decisions favoring its own products or capabilities. Please confirm that Solers, as the parent company of Seros, would be ineligible to bid as the prime on this project due to the fact that Solers would be making implementation decisions on a product in which it maintains a vested interest.

Answer: The government makes implementation decisions.

Question 12: SOW Section 6.2.5 – Seros© Licensing

Pursuing an alternative acquisition method for the Seros© product licenses and optional appliances would alleviate potential conflicts of interest. Would the Government consider having two separate acquisitions, one for product (e.g. Seros©) and one for professional services to reduce potential conflict of interest risk, increase acquisition flexibility, and potentially increase the number of competitive responses?

Answer: This requirement is being competed in accordance with FAR 6.2 - Full and open competition after exclusion of sources (100% small business set-aside). The Government intends to award a single contract resulting from the RFP to the responsible offeror whose proposal represents the **best value** in accordance with the evaluation factors in the solicitation. The Government will evaluate the proposals based on the criteria provided in Attachment 2 of the RFP in which all Non-Cost Factors are significantly more important than Cost Factor when combined.

Question 13: SOW Section 6.2.5.2 – Seros© Appliances (Optional – FFP)

Section 6.2.5.2 does not describe the function that the desired Seros© Appliances will serve. Please provide further details on the desired capabilities and technical specifications the Government is looking for in the Seros© Appliances.

Answer: No substitution in product is allowable.

Question 14: SOW Sections 6.2.5.2 and 12.3 – Other Direct Costs (ODC)

Section 6.2.5.2 specifies two (2) Pre-Production and four (4) Production Seros© Appliances will be procured as an option. Section 12.3 states that “Hardware, Seros, and AmberPoint© Licenses for Seros Enterprise Service Management (ESM) for one (1) Production appliance.” Please clarify the appliance quantities and whether the Pre-Production and Production appliances are required or provided as an option.

Answer: Section 12.3 is revised as follows:

12.3 Other Direct Costs (ODC)

Contractor shall comply with the requirements for full and open competition by following all applicable acquisition regulations and determining price reasonableness if items are not listed in Schedule contracts. Teaming with other Schedule holders may be necessary in order to procure items. Incidental supplies, equipment, and materials required for performance of this effort shall

be identified in the contractor's proposal. The contractor will be required to purchase, on behalf of the government:

- Eight (8) server, sixteen CPU license renewal for Seros© Information Distribution Suite (IDS)

The contractor may be required to purchase, on behalf of the government:

- Hardware, Seros, and AmberPoint© Licenses for Seros Enterprise Service Management (ESM) for two (2) Pre-Production appliances
- Hardware, Seros, and AmberPoint© Licenses for Seros Enterprise Service Management (ESM) for four (4) Production appliance

Question 15: SOW Section 9. – Delivery of Schedule

Narrative section states: “unless otherwise specified, all days are government working days.” While the Due Date heading states “Calendar Days After TO Start.” Please clarify whether the deliverable due dates are given in government working days or calendar days.

Answer: Calendar Days after TO Start is correct.

Question 16: SOW Section 10 – Security

Subsection 10.1 is omitted from the SOW. Please confirm that this was a typographical error and no pertinent data has been omitted from the SOW.

Answer: A: It was a typographical error.

Question 17: WSN-Attachment 2 – Evaluation Criteria 1b

Joint User Messaging appears to be a term that is only used in reference to this project. As this may be construed as providing an advantage to the contractor initially providing this service, would the Government consider either removing the phrase “particularly Joint User Messaging” or substituting a generic industry phrase such as “particularly Event-driven Messaging?”

Answer: Joint User Messaging is a generic title referencing a messaging capability to support reliable message delivery for the Department. This capability leverages the WS_Notification specification for Machine to Messaging. As the project and specification evolve, the government may consider modifying the term

Question 18: WSN-Attachment 2 – Evaluation Criteria 1c

Please elaborate on the phrase “Successfully demonstrate recent experience in... providing support of vulnerability testing in accordance with FIPS 140-2.” Are there specific vulnerability areas covered by FIPS 140-2 the Government considers critical (e.g. fault tolerance, EMSEC, etc.)?

Answer: Information Assurance protection levels are critical.

Question 19: WSN-Attachment 4 – OCCI

FAR Subpart 9.505-1(a) in pertinent part precludes a contractor “that provide systems engineering and technical direction for a system but does not have overall contractual responsibility for its development, its integration, assembly, and checkout” from being awarded a contract to supply the system or be a subcontractor to the supplier of the system. FAR 9.505-1(b)

provides definitions: Systems engineering is defined as “determining specifications, identifying and resolving interface problems, developing test requirements, evaluating test data, and supervising design.” Technical direction is defined to include “developing work statements, determining parameters, directing other contractors’ operations, and resolving technical controversies.” Since a contractor providing these services may be deemed as able to influence system requirements to favor its own products, this contractor could be precluded from competition for the contract to supply the system.

In regard to this limitation, the following questions are submitted:

- a) How were the specifications and requirements of the JUM and Web Services Notification systems developed?
- b) Were contractor or consultant services used in the system engineering and technical direction of the JUM or Web Services Notification system? If so, what contractor provided these services and what was the contract or task order number for providing this support?
- c) Was contractor or consultant support used in the development of the Statement of Work, Evaluation Criteria, or RFP instructions for the Web Services Notification Support RFP (#DTOMC95023)? If so, what contractor provided this support?
- d) Are there contractors providing Advisory & Assistance Services (A&AS) in support of the development of the JUM and Web Services Notification system specifications, work statement of RFP DTOMC95023, or evaluation of proposals received in response to RFP DTOMC95023? If so, what contractors were used?

Answer: OCCI is addressed in paragraph 12.2 of the SOW and Attachment 4 of the 4 March RFP.

3. All questions asked have been addressed.

Respectfully,

//signed//

TERRY G. STENERSON
Contracting Officer